

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: CCMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20201 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/211,942	12/15/1998	JIM A. LARSON	884.078US1	9145
75	590 05/14/2002			
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER & KLUTH P O BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER	
			MENGISTU, AMARE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2673	- <u>-</u>

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

Office Action Summary

Applicant(s)

Jim A. Larson et al

Examiner

Application No.

09/211,942

AMARE MENGISTU

Art Unit **2673**



The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	s on the cover sheet with the correspondence address			
Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM			
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In n	o event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the			
mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the	statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.			
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply an Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the 	d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication			
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	s communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any			
Status				
1) 🗓 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Mar 7, 20</u>	02			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This acti	on is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance exclosed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	cept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is arte Quayle35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims				
4) 🔀 Claim(s) <u>4-17</u>	is/are pending in the applica			
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from considera			
	is/are allowed.			
	is/are rejected.			
	is/are objected to.			
	are subject to restriction and/or election requirem			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/a.	re a∏ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawin				
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a☐ approved b)☐disapproved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to the	is Office action.			
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	r.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign prior	ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) All b) Some* c) None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docu	uments have been received in this National Stage			
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the c	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic pri	ority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).			
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional				
15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic pri	ority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
Attachment(s)				
1) XNotice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) This is a Continuous Relative Review (PTO 0.40).	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).			
2) _Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) _Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 3) _Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6) _Other:				
5) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	b)journer:			

Art Unit: 2673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness 1. rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 4-6,8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

As to claims 4-15, Ohashi discloses an input stylus composing: a computer processor (30 (CPU); a housing (fig.2) having a first end and a second end; a microphone (fig.2 (71)) located at the second end for receiving acoustical signals; a transmitter (fig.2(16,18)) located in the housing for transmitting electronic voice signals received by the microphone to an external device (see, Abstract, col.2, lines 39-53), switches (figs.2 and 7 (14,17)) for activating and deactivating the microphone and the transmitter; the transmitter transmits the voice signal via wireless (fig.6a (18)). These switches are equivalent to applicant's single switch. Ohashi discloses a computer processor transmitter for transmitting translated voice data (see, col.2, lines 39 - col.3, lines 21). It is obvious to one skill in the art to have recognize that the Ohashi 's CPU (30) has to have a voice translation software to

Page 3

Art Unit: 2673

translate voice signals into machine readable data in order for the computer to display the voice data transmitted from the stylus and a switch circuit (fig.2(17)) for activating the transmitter.

Ohashi teaches a display screen for producing input signals in response to a physical contact by stylus (see, Abstract, col.2, lines 39-53). Ohashi did not explicitly disclose that the device is a mobile personal digital assistance having a touch screen display. However, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) clearly states that it is well known in the art to use for a mobile personal computer such as lap-tap computer and personal digital assistant to have a touch screen display (pages 1, line 10 - page 2, lines 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to use the stylus of Ohashi into the mobile personal digital assistance of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) because this will provide easy to carry with a greater mobility.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ohashi* in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). as applied to claim 1,3-6,8-15 above, and further in view of *Epperson* (5,247,137).

As to claim 7, Ohashi (as modified by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) clearly teaches a stylus, but failed to teach the stylus having a power supply. The patent of Epperson suggest that it conventional for a stylus to have a poser supply (fig. 1(5,6)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the power supply of Epperson into the stylus of Ohashi, since this will

Art Unit: 2673

allow the stylus of Ohashi with a power source to ensure simplicity and higher efficiency of

operation.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne et al 4

(5,867,821) in view of *Ditzik* (5,983,073).

As to claims 16; Ballantyne et al (hereinafter Ballantyne) discloses a wireless

communication between PC to PDA comprising: a wireless transmitting by a stylus to the PC from

a PDA (fig.1 (PDA "10" to PCS; fig. 6 (stylus "104"; PDA "100" to PC)); wireless transmitting from

the PC to PDA (see, fig.1 "PCS to PDA). Ballantyne also teaches that it is well known for PCS to

have a voice recognition software (col.11, lines 45-55). Ballantyne did not disclose the voice

communication between the PDA to PC and translating the voice to text and displaying the text on

the PDA. The Patent of Ditzik is cited to teach that it is well known for PCS and PDA to have a bi-

directional communication of voice, audio, text, graphics, image and/or video data (col.2, lines 51-

65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was

made to have been motivated to incorporate the audio and text communication system of Ditzik's

into the device of Ballantyne, because this will provide the system of Ballantyne to have more

capabilities to communicate with varies communication devices.

Page 4

Art Unit: 2673

Allowable Subject Matter

Page 5

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable 5.

if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening

claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-15 have been considered but are moot in view 6.

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Amare Mengistu 7.

at telephone number (703) 305-4880.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or

"DRAFT")

Page 6

Art Unit: 2673

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.

VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

A. Mengistu

Art unit 2673

May 1,2002

Amare Mengistu